

(2)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI

O.A. No.264/2003

This the 6th day of February, 2003

Hon'ble Shri Justice V.S. Aggarwal, Chairman
Hon'ble Shri S.K. Malhotra, Member (A)

A.S. Ravi
5/o Shri Lekh Raj Singh,
R/o Northern Railway Staff Quarters,
Near Railway Station, Moradabad.

(By Advocate : Shri K.K. Sharma)Applicant

Versus

1. Union of India
Through Secretary,
Ministry of Railways,
Railway Bhawan,
New Delhi.
2. General Manager,
Northern Railway, Baroda House,
New Delhi.
3. Divisional Railway Manager,
Muradabad Division,
Muradabad.
4. Sr. Divisional Accounts Officer,
Muradabad Division,
Muradabad.
5. L.S. Rana,
Asstt. Accountant
C/o Sr. Divisional Accounts Officer,
Muradabad Division,
Muradabad.

...Respondents

ORDER (ORAL)

Shri Justice V.S. Aggarwal, Chairman :

The applicant, by virtue of the present application, seeks that his pay should be stepped up viz-a-viz respondent No.5 and he should be provided year-wise pay fixation details. He seeks further arrears on account of difference in his basic pay and and respondent No.5.

2. Applicant had joined as a Clerk Grade-II in the office of Senior Divisional Accounts Officer,

18 Ag

(3)

Northern Railway, Moradabad on 24.1.1976. Respondent No.5 has joined on the similar post on 16.6.1979. The applicant was promoted as Clerk Grade-I on the basis of seniority-cum-fitness on 10.8.1981 while the respondent No.5 was promoted as such on 24.2.1984.

3. Thereafter the respondent No.5 was promoted as Assistant Accountant on 24.2.1984 and the applicant was also awarded another promotion to the post of Accounts Assistant on 1.5.1986.

4. These facts clearly indicate that the respondent No.5 has scored march over the applicant in the year 1984. Obviously, he was drawing more salary than the applicant. The applicant did not wake up to the situation at the relevant time. Presently, he seeks that he was senior earlier in the year 1984 to respondent no.5 and should be awarded more salary. The said prayed should well have been made at an appropriate time, but presently, it has become barred by time.

5. Resultently, the original application is without merit and must fail and is accordingly dismissed in limine.

Omee
(S.K. Mathotra)
Member (A)

Ag
(V.S. Aggarwal)
Chairman

/ravi/